Exhibit B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Alexandria Division

SONY MUSIC ENTERTAINMENT, et al.,
Plaintiffs,

-vs- Case No. 1:18-cv-950

COX COMMUNICATIONS, INC., et al.,
Defendants.

STATUS CONFERENCE

November 26, 2019

Before: Liam O'Grady, USDC Judge

APPEARANCES:

Matthew J. Oppenheim, Scott A. Zebrak, Jeffrey M. Gould, and Jia Ryu, Counsel for the Plaintiffs

Thomas M. Buchanan, Michael S. Elkin, Jennifer A. Golinveaux, Thomas P. Lane, Sean R. Anderson, and Cesie C. Alvarez, Counsel for the Defendants

There is no mention of any of them on those notices. They never sent any.

So that's another way to streamline this case, is because those, as we moved, and based on your Court's ruling applying the same logic, they should be out.

So we really should just be talking about the notices that went on behalf of the record label companies and those works in suit. Which, actually, when you reduce them down, there is like 2,000 because the notices with regard to those contain references to songs in which they have Bruce Springsteen, Born to Run, and embedded within that is somebody that's gone out there and added all sorts of other works that don't relate in like a zip and we're suppose to have notice of that. Those were two issues that we raised.

But the one right now is, clearly, under the Court's logic and reasoning in the summary judgment decision, there is no way we could be put on notice of the musical compositions of the music publishers.

THE COURT: Okay. So this is a motion to reconsider? Yes, sir.

MR. OPPENHEIM: There is a little -- too cute by halves in there, Your Honor. I mean, I do agree with Mr. Buchanan that the opinion does say, notices from record companies and music publishers, that is certainly true.

It was clear that the Court rejected Cox's argument

that every notice had to specify every work that was being infringed in it. The Court followed what the Fourth Circuit said. Which is, was it sufficient notice for Cox to do something about it? And that's what those notices were.

So here, compositions are contained with sound recordings. Right? And so, Mr. Buchanan saying, well, there was no notice as to the compositions, well, of course there was. There was no need to send a separate notice, which would be the exact same notice, only specify the composition. It would be the exact same infringer, the exact same date and time, on the exact same network. It would be exactly the same.

So the Court -- the Court has made a finding, which was undisputed, that Cox had knowledge of the infringing acts such that they could do something about it. And nothing that Mr. Buchanan has said should disturb that. He's just pointing to the one phrase within the opinion which, you know, he thinks is a little inelegant. But the point of the decision is very clear and should be undisturbed.

THE COURT: All right. Yes, sir.

MR. BUCHANAN: Just briefly, Your Honor. I mean, it's under Rule 54(b), and it is a timely motion. We haven't filed it. We haven't it filed, but we are arguing it now. There is no dispute that there is a mistake of fact. The plaintiffs just admitted that.

THE COURT: I will look at it, Mr. Buchanan.